

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 9, 2004. The present amendment is submitted to reduce the issues on appeal.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 9 is objected to based on a minor informality. Note that the Examiner's suggestion has been adopted (i.e., inserting a comma after "cavity" in the second to last line), and thus the objection is now clearly obviated. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to enter the above amendment.

With regard to the obviousness double patenting rejection, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection because the claims in copending application no. 10/018,174 currently do not include the limitation of an insulating plate having a protrusion extending in an axial direction of the mold along the wall of the cavity. As this feature is the primary novel feature of independent claims 9 and 14 of the present application, it is submitted the obviousness rejection should now be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Inge JOHANSEN et al.

By: Michael S. Huppert

Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 13, 2005